UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRANDON G. ADAMS,	
Plaintiff,	Case No. 24-cv-13134
v.	Hon. Mark A. Goldsmith
DAVE YOST, et al,	
Defendants.	
	/

ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITH PREJUDICE

Plaintiff Brandon G. Adams filed this case on November 25, 2024 (Dkt. 1). He failed to pay the filing fee after he was ordered to do so no later than December 9, 2024. See Notice of Filing Fee Not Paid at PageID.11 (Dkt. 3). That deadline has long passed and Plaintiff has not either paid the fee or sought in forma pauperis status.

Additionally, upon review of the complaint, Plaintiff's claim is nonsensical and, therefore, Plaintiff fails to meet his burden of demonstrating that this Court has jurisdiction to hear his claim. See Compl. at PageID.4–6 (Dkt. 1). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) states: "[i]f the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action." Plaintiff's complaint alleges that this Court has federal question jurisdiction, see id. at PageID.3–4, and then lists, without any further explanation: "Fifth, Seventh, Fourteenth Amendment, Article VI Supreme Law Clause 2 Supremacy Clause, Rule 21. Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition, and Other Extraordinary Writs, Rule 46. Objecting to a Ruling or Order, Dairy Queen, Inc. v. Wood, 369 U.S. 469 (1962) Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990) Ryland v. Shapiro, 708 F.2d 967 (5th

Case 2:24-cv-13134-MAG-DRG ECF No. 26, PageID.118 Filed 04/30/25 Page 2 of 2

Cir. 1983) Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)[.]" Id. at PageID.4 (Dkt. 1). Merely listing

Constitutional Amendments and names of cases does not confer federal question jurisdiction. Nor

does Plaintiff's statement of claim, which appears to be a list of documents of some sort, provide

any more context. Id. at PageID.5-6 (Dkt. 1).

Moreover, and without first obtaining leave to do so, Plaintiff has filed numerous

documents and notices on the docket in this case. See Docket (Dkts.5–8, 9–16, 19–24). None of

these filings could be reasonably construed as a clarification of Plaintiff's claim or Court's

jurisdiction to hear this case.

For these reasons, the Court dismisses Plaintiff's case with prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 30, 2025

Detroit, Michigan

s/Mark A. Goldsmith

MARK A. GOLDSMITH

United States District Judge

2